

R E M A R K S

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application. Claim 8 has been canceled.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102

The rejection on page 2 of the last Office Action of claims 1-5 and 7 as lacking novelty under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over U.S. Patent 6,294,260 (Subramanian) is traversed but has been rendered moot by the present amendments. By the present amendments the substrate has been limited to one consisting essentially of either molybdenum or tantalum. Subramanian does not disclose a substrate of molybdenum or tantalum as required by the pending claims. As explained in the document entitled "REPLY UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111" filed on or about November 24, 2004, Subramanian discloses only substrates of a nickel or a cobalt based super alloy neither of which are within the scope of those now claimed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The rejection on page 3 of the last Office Action of claims 1-3 and 5-7 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent 6,387,526 (Beele) in view of U.S. Patent 5,514,482 (Strangman) is traversed. Neither Beele nor Strangman disclose substrates of molybdenum or tantalum as required by the present claims.

The rejection on page 4 of the last Office Action of claims 1, 5, 6, and 7 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent 6,440,575 (Heimberg) in view of Strangman is traversed. Neither Heimberg nor Strangman disclose substrates of either molybdenum or tantalum as required by the present claims.

The rejection on page 4 of the last Office Action of claim 5 as obvious under 35 U.S.C. § 103 over U.S. Patent 6,177,200 (Maloney) is traversed. Maloney does not disclose substrates consisting essentially of either molybdenum or tantalum as required by the present claims. Maloney teaches only substrates of iron, nickel or cobalt based super alloys.

The cited references completely fail to teach or suggest the use of the specific substrate for the coated member and the features thereof. Accordingly, the present invention is neither disclosed nor obvious over the cited references.

Conclusion

Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact David R. Murphy (Reg. No. 22,751) at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 
Gerald M. Murphy, Jr., #28,977

P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000

GMM/DRM: bmp
0171-1056P